Journal of
Higher Education Policy
And
Leadership Studies

JHEPALS (E-ISSN: 2717-1426)

https://johepal.com

Organizational Factors Affecting Lecturer Performance in HEIs in the Context of Blended Learning: An Empirical Study in Vietnam



Nguyen Thi Thuy Hanh

English Faculty, Thuongmai University, Hanoi, VIETNAM
Email: nguyenthuyhanh79@tmu.edu.vn
https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7039-9970

Article Received **2023/10/06**

Article Accepted **2023/12/12**

Published Online **2023/12/31**

Cite article as:

Hanh, N. T. T. (2023). Organizational factors affecting lecturer performance in HEIs in the context of blended learning: An empirical study in Vietnam. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Leadership Studies*, *4*(4), 32-49.
https://dx.doi.org/10.61186/johepal.4.4.32

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

Organizational Factors Affecting Lecturer Performance in HEIs in the Context of Blended Learning: An Empirical Study in Vietnam

Journal of Higher Education Policy And Leadership Studies (JHEPALS)

E-ISSN: 2717-1426
Volume: 4 Issue: 4
pp. 32-49
DOI:
10.61186/johepal.4.4.32

Nguyen Thi Thuy Hanh *

Abstract

This study is an attempt to investigate the influence of organizational factors, including institutional policies, work environment, infrastructure, and workload on the performance of lecturers in Vietnamese higher education institutions. Performance was tested to measure their effectiveness as well as discover important variations between particular groups. This empirical study follows a quantitative approach based on the collection of authentic data through questionnaires from 200 lecturers affiliated with 10 higher education institutions in Vietnam. All quantitative data were placed in a comprehensive database and processed by using Statistical Package for the Social Science software. The study's key findings suggest that factors significantly influencing lecturer performance include training, performance evaluation, salary (institutional policies); colleague support, feedback on performance, organizational communication (work environment); furniture and computer technology (infrastructure); doing research, teaching and testing, and blended course designing (workload). The performance of lecturers is found to be unaffected by the other components in a substantial way, namely incentives, leadership, noise and light, community service. The results of the research output measurement showed that lecturers lacked research abilities. A number of managerial implications are then discussed with an aim of enhancing the performance of lecturers in higher education institutions.

Keywords: Blended Learning; Organizational Factor; Higher Education Institution (HEI); Lecturer Performance

*Corresponding author's email: nguyenthuyhanh79@tmu.edu.vn

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

Introduction

Over the last decades, higher education has seen significant changes with the penetration of the Internet and ubiquitous technologies in individuals' lives. Information and communication technologies have had a significant impact on education (Ata, 2016), which has led to the development of e-learning systems (Silva et al., 2022). Especially, blended learning has emerged as a solution that has made it possible for higher education (HE) institutions to integrate e-learning into their learning environments to enhance the learning process (Aldraiweesh & Alturki, 2023), improve students' learning and engagement (Jumani et al., 2018), increases information access and provides a flexible approach to studying while adhering to HE institutions' requirements (Prifti, 2022). The new educational vision of higher education is to ensure effective teaching in universities (Rasheed et al., 2010) and to be able to determine this effectiveness (Mastrokoukou et al., 2022). All institutions are concerned to find out the ways through which high level of their lecturer performance can be achieved because lecturer performance is critical to the overall success of education institutions (Lutfah et al., 2019), proper utilization of lecturers can lead an institution from bottom to top. Therefore, there has been a growth of human resources management and employee performance management practices in HE institutions such as planning, monitoring, and evaluation (Kowal et al., 2010).

The current literature confirms that there are key factors in HE institutions that impact greatly on the performance of their employees. Arinanye (2015) indicated that the determinants of teacher performance are personal, organizational, environmental, motivation, skill level, aptitudes and role perceptions. Conducted a similar investigation, Hasan (2017) discovered that work motivation, school principal leadership, and organizational culture were predictors of teacher performance. In their work, Hasbay and Altindag (2018) confirmed that, management, work environment, and wage are influential factors on the performance of lecturers. Good results and increased productivity are assumed to be the result of better work environment (Sirait et al., 2021; Auliana et al., 2021). Evidence also suggests that teacher performance and school principal leadership are positively correlated and significantly influence teacher performance (Gewasari, 2016).

As mentioned above, many studies done by different scholars have identified management, leadership, work environment, wage, and organizational culture as some of the factors affecting lecturer performance. However, no research has been done on the combined effects of institutional policies, work environment, infrastructure, and workload on lecturer performance together in the context of blended learning, which is essential to institutional management. Researchers also have not examined the influential factors as well not measured the effectiveness of lecturers inside Vietnamese HE institutions. This raises the researcher's curiosity and hence the need to fill this research gap. The study sought to address the following research questions in order to fulfill its goals:

- What are factors that possibly affect the performance of lecturers in HE institutions?
- How do these factors affect the performance of lecturers?
- What are some possible recommendations to maximize the performance of lecturers?

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

Lecturer Performance in Higher Education Institutions

One of the cornerstones of strategic management of human resources in HE institutions is measuring lecturer performance. Performance is a result of work or the level of success achieved by employees in their field of work which can be directly reflected in the output produced both in terms of quantity and quality, according to the criteria applied to the job (Arifani & Susanti, 2020). According to Lutfah et al. (2019), teacher performance is the teacher's perception on teacher work performance related to the quality of work, responsibility, honesty, cooperation and initiative. Teacher performance is normally looked at in terms of outcomes (Ng et al., 2023). It can, however, also be referred to as the embodiment of the work on the job, activity and behavior within the specified time limit (Arinanye, 2015). A good competency of a power teacher goes linear with the achievements of students (Kanya et al., 2021). High performance is a step towards the achievement of organizational goals and tasks (Muslih et al., 2022). However, the measurement of teacher performance has remained vague, in part because there has been no consensus on what an effective teacher is and does (Mastrokoukou et al., 2022). In Arinanye's research (2015), employee performance in education institutions was measured in form of efficiency, quality, productivity and timeliness. In the meanwhile, Molefe (2010) assessed the teacher performance using seven performance dimensions: knowledge (subject knowledge), testing (assessment) procedures, student-teacher relations, organizational skills, communication skills, subject relevance, and utility of assignments. The performance was also assessed via the success of lecturers in conducting the teaching and learning process that consists of planning, implementation, and evaluation (Setyaningsih & Sukono, 2022).

In Vietnam, The Ministry of Education and Training is putting its extreme efforts in enhancing universities performance. It is obvious that intention behind the initiatives taken by HE institutions is to motivate teachers to improve their performance, therefore they can help to improve HE standard in Vietnam as a whole. One way to measure lecturer performance is to create a scorecard of sorts that would measure various aspects of their performance. In recent years, many Vietnamese HE institutions have applied the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) system to evaluate the performance of their staff, including lecturers and non-teaching staff. HE institutions provide a wide range of KPI criteria so that their employees choose to be evaluated at the end of the academic year. Among the standards given, the five most typical indicators used are teacher evaluation by students, instructional assessment skill, blended teaching competency, research output, and community service output. Consequently, the present study employed these criteria as the measurement of lecturer performance in HE institutions.

Factors affecting Performance of Lecturers

Institutional Policies

Many institutional policies have been found to have a close relationship with lecturer performance. Findings of the research have shown that compensation packages and financial incentives are important factors for employees in the competitive market environment of the higher education sector (Rasheed et al., 2016; Hervie & Winful, 2018; Orji, 2021; Chai, 2022). Poor performance of teachers was due to lack of incentives and

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

motivation (Lutfah et al., 2019), lack of frequent in-service training, and improper supervision (Hervie & Winful, 2018). In addition, lecturers' work performance can improve with professional training programs including activities contributing to positive experiences of teaching-related competencies and skills (Rasheed et al., 2016) as well as to deeper reflection on academic roles in higher education (Fabriz et al., 2021). In the blended learning, for lecturers to perform better academically and become more technologically literate, HEIs must offer rigorous training courses, such as training on using online learning software, compiling learning materials based on online applications, and so (Setyaningsih & Sukono, 2022). Once lecturers have been trained, inspired, and assigned to their various position, it is crucial for the institutional administration to conduct performance evaluations to determine whether or not they are effective at their work (Kagema & Irungu, 2018). When organized around clearly established and accepted standards of practice, lecturer evaluation offers an opportunity to reflect seriously on their practice and guide their professional development (Sawchuk, 2015) and promote learning (Danielson, 2008). Keeping in view the above discussion, the following hypothesis is proposed:

- Hypothesis 1. There is a correlation between institutional policies and performance of lecturers.

Work Environment

Several authors have drawn the significant influence of work environment on teacher performance and concluded that a comfortable work environment will be a driving force for enthusiasm and work efficiency which in turn will encourage work productivity. Teachers and their performance can be affected by various factors including the principal's leadership style, work culture (Sirait et al., 2021), the work environment concerned and work motivation (Auliana et al., 2021). Additionally, it is crucial to provide teachers with feedback on their performance, both good and bad, in order to maintain a conducive workplace (Kanya et al., 2021). Obviously, feedback effectively communicates the status of lecturer performance, based on measurable guidelines and tools. Besides, organizational communication is essential for fostering better workplace relationships, sharing information, collaborating with one another, and ultimately improving the work environment for everyone (Parveen et al., 2012). Similarly, Kotter and Heskett (1992) state that effective organizational communication is critical to actively engage employees, foster trust and respect, and promote productivity. Taking it all together, this study proposes the following hypothesis:

- Hypothesis 2. Good work environment will lead to higher level of work performance.

Infrastructure

The infrastructure or facilities have always been of interest to employees because they relate to personal convenience helping them complete the tasks. Good working conditions related to computer technology, furniture, light, noise and other environmental factors provide greater physical comfort for teachers (Obineli, 2013; Sogoni, 2017), boost teacher performance (Maryodona et al., 2022) as well as students' academic performance and accomplishment in blended learning settings (Dubey et al., 2023). In contrast, teachers' low performance was influenced by a lack of instructional materials (Hervie & Winful, 2018). Technological factors are identified by instructors as the most relevant for in designing

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

online instruction (Ata, 2016), and the most challenging (Jumani et al., 2018). The core technology used in blended learning courses is the Learning Management System (LMS), an information system that facilitates e-learning by supporting teaching and learning activities, as well as the management and interaction associated with them (Prifti, 2022). Learning facility and technology literacy are related to each other (Çetin, 2021) and influence the lecturer performance in conducting not only the traditional face-to-face learning but blended learning as well (Setyaningsih & Sukono, 2022). Therefore, the study proposes the following hypothesis:

- Hypothesis 3. Better infrastructure can be positively associated with performance of lecturers.

Workload

Workload refers to the quantity and intensity of job assignments. Simply put, the core consideration in workload could be seen in the quantity of work being assigned and the degree of efforts to be exerted before completing the work (Osifila & Aladetan, 2020). Educational professionals not only need to carry out teaching, supervision, students' consultation (Ujir et al., 2020) but are also required to carry out research and community service (Mulyana et al., 2021). Numeral studies have highlighted the consequences of work overload, and they have claimed the negative effect of workload like teaching, conducting research, supervision of undergraduate projects, marking of examination scripts on teachers' job satisfaction and their overall performance in their work (Osifila & Aladetan, 2020; Ujir et al., 2020).

In the present digital era, HE institutions offer blended learning courses that integrate online with traditional face-to-face class activities in a planned, pedagogically valuable manner; and where a portion (institutionally defined) of face-to-face time is replaced by online activity (Alammary et al., 2014). It is expected of lecturers to be innovative when providing online materials and making the best use of Google Classroom, video conferencing tools like Zoom, Skype, Trans, etc. (Setyaningsih & Sukono, 2022). With a large number of blended learning course designs available, selecting most appropriate approach is becoming a major challenge, particularly for individuals without the required theoretical grounding and practical expertise in blended learning, which is the case for most HE teachers (Huang & Zhou, 2012). For many HE professors who are not familiar with blended learning, selecting the best design strategy for a mixed course can be very challenging (Alammary et al., 2014). In Vietnamese HE institutions, teachers must dedicate a lot of time to activities like teaching and testing, research, textbook designing, blended course designing, community service, etc.

Based on the reviewed literature related to workload as well as the real situation of lecturer workload in Vietnamese HE institutions, we have come up with the following hypothesis for this study:

- Hypothesis 4. Workload affects the performance of lecturers negatively.

Research Model

On the basis of the literature review and the researcher's focus on the performance of lecturers, this study explicitly identified lecturer performance as a dependent variable; the

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

independent variables are: institutional policies, work environment, infrastructure, and workload. Therefore, the research model is as follows (Figure 1.):



Figure 1. Research Model

Materials and Research Methodology

Research Method

This is an empiric study. The quantitative approach is adopted for this study in order to fulfill the objectives of the study. All the interpretations, comments and conclusions of research findings are based primarily on the statistics of the survey questionnaires. The analysis of and comments on the statistics are also based on discussions with friends, colleagues as well as the author's observations and experiences.

Data Collection Instruments

After reading many studies on Factors affecting employees' performance and the researcher found that two comprehensive questionnaires originally developed by Naseem et al. (2012) and Khan et al. (2012) are very appropriate and useful for the data analysis to achieve the objectives of this study. The questionnaire was adapted to the particular context and sample population, and in accordance with the four hypotheses of this study. The survey questionnaire consists of two main parts: Part 1 is designed for general information about the informants' background (age, gender, education degree, types of higher education institutions). Part 2 consists of 34 questions. All 34 questions were designed with five-point scale from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). The questions were designed to measure the correlation between the factors, namely institutional policies, work environment, infrastructure, workload and performance of lecturers in HE institutions.

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

Samples and Sampling

The researcher randomly emailed and handed out questionnaires to 216 lecturers from 10 different public and private HE institutions implementing blended learning, inclusive six in Hanoi, three in Ho Chi Minh City and one in Danang, Vietnam. The respondents are from 25 to nearly 50 years old. Their education background is either master or PhD degree.

Data Analysis

The data collected was processed by using Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) software. Regarding the reliability of the measurement tool, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was used to test the reliability of the variables (questions) used in the questionnaire. The independent variables Institutional policies, Work environment, Infrastructure, workload have the Cronbach alpha coefficient of 7.30; 7.98; 6.74; 7.84 respectively. Five observed variable Training2, Evaluation1, Feedback1, Noise1, material would be rejected in the data analysis, as their Corrected Item - Total Correlation is only at .285. The Corrected Item - Total Correlation of other observed variables are greater than 0.3, thus these variables should meet the requirements included in subsequent factor analysis. In this study, the KMO is equal 0.623 (>0.5). The Cumulative is equal 76.639%, which is more than 50%. And the rotated Component Matrixa shows that all these observed variables are more than 0.3. Therefore, all these 29 variables are appropriate to be analyzed in the following procedure. The diminishing of 5 variables didn't affect any groups. Therefore, the research model remains as suggested initially.

Results and Discussion

Correlation between Factors and Lecturer Performance

Correlation between institutional policies and lecturer performance

Better outcomes and increased performance are assumed to be the result of better policies. This assumption is believed to be true when we look at Table 1. The factors like training, performance evaluation and salary have effect on lecturer performance. Of all these three factors, salary is the strongest influential factor when its beta is 0.913, t= 11.513, followed by the performance evaluation factor with beta equal 0.562, t equal 7.859; The next factor that has quite a strong impact on performance is training, with beta = 0.442, t = 4.349. In contrast to what is assumed is the factor incentives, which is shown through the data analysis that it has little effect on performance.

Table 1.
Correlation between institutional policies and lecturer performance

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	2.888	.237		12.181	.000		
Training	.288	.067	.442	4.319	.000	.286	3.497
Performance evaluation	.525	.067	.562	7.859	.000	.585	1.709
Salary	.968	.084	.913	11.513	.000	.475	2.103
Incentives	-.046	.069	-.064	-.668	.505	.322	3.104

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

Correlation between work environment factors and lecturer performance

The data in Table 2 clearly show that leadership has no impact on performance of lecturers (sig. = 0.311, beta = 0.25), which is opposite to our assumption. In contrast with the factor leadership, colleague support has the greatest impact on performance, with Beta equal 0.477, t= 11.918. The second influential element is organizational communication (Beta equal 0.476, t= 10.618), followed by the factor performance feedback (Sig. = 0.028; Beta = 0.145, t= 2.212). It is true that working environment is crucial element in how well professors perform.

Table 2.
Correlation between work environment factors and lecturer performance

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	.015	.096		.158	.874		
Leadership	.028	.028	.025	1.015	.311	.654	1.529
Colleague support	.382	.032	.477	11.918	.000	.249	4.017
Performance feedback	.158	.072	.145	2.212	.028	.093	10.737
Organizational communication	.412	.039	.476	10.618	.000	.199	5.036

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

Correlation between infrastructure factors and lecturer performance

Looking at the figure in Table 3, we can easily see that of the four variables mentioned, only two variables affect the performance of lecturers: furniture (with the sig. equal 0.00, Beta equal 0.437, t= 9.152) and computer technology (with the sig. equal 0.00, Beta equal 0.622, t= 14.042); In contrast, the variables like noise and light don't affect teachers much. Computer technology was found to have the strongest influence on the effectiveness of lecturers. We can also conclude that better infrastructure of office will boost the lecturers perform better.

Table 3.
Correlation between infrastructure factors and lecturer performance

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	-.187	.140		-1.338	.182		
Computer technology	.703	.050	.622	14.042	.000	.436	2.292
Noise	-.025	.027	-.030	-.933	.352	.811	1.233
Furniture	.420	.046	.437	9.152	.000	.375	2.666
Light	-.074	.043	-.077	-1.718	.087	.428	2.337

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

Factors Affecting Lecturer Performance in HEIs

Correlation between workload factors and lecturer performance

As we can see from Table 4, workload from community service has no impact on the effectiveness of lecturers, this is clearly shown through the Sig. equal 0.416. Doing research has the strongest influence over performance with Beta = 0.429, t= 6.442. Lecturing and evaluating students' academic achievements are in the second place with Beta equal 0.321, t= 4.053. Blended course designing with Sig. = 0.004, Beta = 0.212, t = 2.903 takes the third place.

Table 4.
Correlation between workload factors and lecturer performance

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	2.231	.298		7.475	.000		
Teaching and testing	.243	.060	.321	4.053	.000	.587	1.702
Blended course designing	.187	.065	.212	2.903	.004	.693	1.444
Research	.401	.062	.429	6.442	.000	.830	1.205
Community service	-.048	.058	-.055	-.816	.416	.809	1.236

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

Regression results of research model and testing of hypotheses

The regression equation shows the relationship between performance of lecturers within HE institutions with the independent variables include Workload, Policies, Environment, Infrastructure, as follows:

Lecturer performance = .809 + 0.441 policies + 0.452* environment + 0.279* infrastructure + 0.070* workload*

We can recognize that the most significant factor affecting lecturer performance is work environment, with beta = 0.452. Institutional policies take the second place with beta = 0.441. Infrastructure fills the third slot, with beta = 0.279. The least significant factor found to be related to performance is workload, with beta = 0.070.

Hypothesis 1. *There is a correlation between institutional policies and performance of lecturers.* Table 5 presents the association between institutional policies and performance. Beta = 0.441 shows a significant association between institutional policies and lecturer performance. Sig = .000 also shows positive relationship between the variables. It means institutional policies had significantly positive impact on lecturer performance. Therefore, the hypothesis "There is a correlation between institutional policies and performance of lecturers" is accepted.

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

Table 5.
The influence of groups of factors on performance

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.809	.152		5.327	.000		
	policies	.547	.092	.441	5.972	.000	.095	10.511
	environment	.529	.095	.452	5.582	.000	.079	12.663
	infrastructure	.295	.056	.279	5.280	.000	.186	5.365
	workload	.083	.029	.070	2.896	.004	.887	1.127

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

Hypothesis 2. *Good work environment will lead to higher level of work performance.* The second hypothesis was that good work environment will lead to a higher level of work performance which is approved by looking on correlation values: beta = 0.452, t = 5.582, sig = .000. Its values show that work environment has the strongest influence over the performance of lecturers. Thus, this hypothesis is found to be true.

Hypothesis 3. *Better infrastructure has positive impact on performance of lecturers.* As we can see from the figure, there is a correlation between infrastructure and lecturer performance. Sig = .000 shows a significant association between infrastructure of work place and lecturer performance. Beta = 0.279, t = 5.280 also show the relationship between the variables. It means the performance of professors is somewhat affected by the infrastructure at the workplace. Consequently, the supposition "*Better infrastructure has positive impact on performance of lecturers*" is confirmed.

Hypothesis 4. *Workload affects the performance of lecturers negatively.* Table 5 presents the association between workload and performance of lecturers. The sig = 0.004 shows a significant association between workload and lecturer performance. It also shows relationship between the variables. It means workload also had impact on performance of lecturers. As a result, the hypothesis "Workload affects the performance of lecturers negatively" is accepted.

The Assessment of the Performance of Lecturers

The statistics results in Table 6 show quite high means (4.13, 3.83 and 3.61) of the data collected from observed variables related to the performance of lecturers for the criteria community service output, teacher evaluation by students, and instructional assessment skill over students' test score respectively. This can be inferred that with favorable working conditions, lecturers of Vietnamese HE institutions have quite a high level of performance related to their assessment skill, their students' satisfaction as well as community service. Conversely, the low means, together with high Standard Deviation for the two measures, namely blended teaching competency and research output, indicated that research skills and blended teaching competency are lacking among lecturers.

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

Table 6.
Descriptive statistics about Performance of lecturers

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Teacher evaluation by students	200	2	5	3.83	.778
Instructional assessment skill	200	2	5	3.61	.726
Blended teaching competency	200	2	5	3.11	1.016
Research output	200	1	5	2.51	1.023
Community service output	200	3	5	4.13	.616
Valid N (listwise)	200				

The Assessment of lecturer performance among different groups

The independent-samples T-test and ANOVA (Analysis of variance) are employed to examine the differences in the level of performance of teachers by different genders, ages, types of HE institutions, and education level. According to the results of t-Test of Variances and ANOVA results, with almost tests' significance level sig.< 0.05 (sig = 0.00), it can be concluded there is significant difference of level of performance in line with different genders, ages, HE institutions, and education level. Thus, we can conclude the performance of employees of distinct genders, ages, HE institutions, and education level are unalike, in terms of evaluation by students, research output, community service output and blended teaching competency. Only one factor goes under no significant different between employees of different education level, that is instructional assessment skill, with the Sig. = 0.644, which is more than 0.05.

Discussion

The findings of the study suggest that the factors contributing to the work environment and productivity of lecturers in HE institutions include colleague relationships and support, organizational communication, and performance feedback. This finding is in line with researches conducted by Naseem (2012), Rahardjo (2014), Mulyana et al. (2021), Selpiyani et al. (2021), Muslih et al. (2022). Surprisingly, this result is opposite to Auliana's research (2021) which showed that the teacher's work environment has a negative and insignificant effect on teacher performance. Leadership was discovered not to have a significant impact on lecturer performance, which is contrary to the conclusion declared by Kanya et al. (2021) and Sirait et al. (2021). It is true that the work environment will determine a person's comfort at work. More and more good work environment will lead to the achievement of organizational performance maximum (Lutfah et al., 2019). A good work environment will have an impact on increasing the quality of work, giving peace to the eyes and spiritual desire, by this way, it can support the morale of lecturers to work and complete their tasks, which results in the improving of their performance.

The findings revealed that lecturer performance is directly influenced by such factors as training, performance evaluation and salary, which are in accordance with the opinions of many experts like Rasheed et al. (2016), Hervie and Winful (2018), Orji (2021), and Chai (2022). Better policies are discovered to be beneficial for teacher's professional development leading to better results and higher performance. Poor performance of

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

teachers was due to lack of frequent in-service training, lack of teaching and learning materials, lack of incentives and motivation, and improper supervision. Surprisingly, the data analysis of the present study demonstrated that the factor incentives, contrary to what was assumed, has no effect on performance.

Regarding the impact of infrastructure on lecturer performance, some aspects are found to be positively correlated with the performance of lecturers, namely computer technology and furniture. Lecturers' motivation and performance will increase with a better physical work environment. These findings are also consistent with the theory of Sogoni (2017) and Selpiyani et al. (2021) that teacher performance is affected by workplace environment and office design. Obviously, when teachers are working in a setting with practical and enough equipment, as well as a tidy, peaceful, and comfortable atmosphere, they always experience a sense of safety, which makes them more at ease and improves their performance. Undoubtedly, the use of educational technology has become essential for teachers because of its importance in today's education industry. HE institutions in Vietnam have also embraced technology as an integral part of their education process, because computer technology in education helps lecturers provide the best possible education for their students. This result is contrary to Paveen's conclusion in their study (Parveen et al., 2012) which stated that infrastructure at workplace had no significant impact on employees' performance.

In terms of the influence of workload on lecturer performance in HE institutions, the results of the study suggest that the workload associated with community service has little impact on lecturer performance. By contrast, the performance of lecturers in HE institutions is severely impacted by heavy workload of doing research, teaching and assessing students' academic progress, and designing blended learning courses. The pressure from a heavy workload may actually boost productivity. Increased stress can also result from underutilizing human resources or from lecturers not realizing their full potential. However, this pressure has a negative effect when it is excessive. This study is in line with research conducted by Osifila and Aladetan (2020) and Ujir et al. (2020) who prove that partially and simultaneously workload have a significant effect on teacher performance.

In assessing the performance of lecturers investigated, the statistical findings also demonstrated that with favorable working conditions, lecturers in HE institutions in Vietnam perform at a fairly high level in terms of evaluation by students, instructional assessment of students' test scores, and community service output. The blended teaching competency is not at a very high level, which indicates that extensive technical training has to be provided for many lecturers. The research output measurement finding, on the other hand, showed that lecturers lacked research skills. The findings therefore suggested that lecturers excelled in attaining the graduate program's goals by demonstrating subject-matter expertise, assess students' academic achievement, and taking part in professional institutions' activities. However, lecturers fell short in indicating that they had mastered research techniques in connection to research output, helped graduate students enhance their research skills, and displayed professional development through research activities and publications. These are crucial components of a training and development program that will help professorial lecturers improve the way they prepare, disseminate, and apply their research. Furthermore, there are noticeable differences in performance levels among genders, ages, HE institutions, and educational levels. Thus, we can conclude that, in terms of evaluation

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

by students, research output, community service output, and blended teaching competency, employees of different genders, ages, HE institutions, and educational levels perform differently. Only one factor shows no discernible difference among employees of different education level, that is instructional assessment skill.

Conclusion

The findings from the data collected shows that some factors do not affect performance of lecturers, including incentives (institutional policies), leadership (work environment), noise and light (infrastructure), community service (workload). The other factors are found to have significant influence upon performance of lecturers, including training, performance evaluation, salary (policies); colleague support, feedback on performance, organizational communication (work environment); furniture and computer technology (infrastructure); doing research, teaching and testing, and blended course designing (workload).

After all, it is concluded through the regression model that performance of lecturers in higher education institutions is affected by institutional policies, work environment, infrastructure, and workload. Of all these factors, work environment and institutional policies have the biggest influence on their performance. The findings also indicate that infrastructure, to some extent, affect positively on the performance of lecturers in HE institutions in Vietnam. Undoubtedly, workload is found to have a negative influence on the performance of Vietnamese lecturers in HE institutions.

In measuring lecturer performance, the study found that lecturers in Vietnamese HE institutions exhibit relatively excellent performance in terms of student evaluation, instructional assessment of students' test scores, and community service. On the other side, the results of the research output measurement showed that lecturers lacked research abilities. Additionally, there are observable variances in performance levels among genders, ages, HE institutions, and educational levels in terms of research output, blended teaching competency, and student evaluation. Only one factor, the ability to conduct instructional assessments, does not clearly distinguish across teachers with varying levels of education.

There were some limitations to the present study that could be translated into opportunities for future research. First of all, the present study focused on external factors. As reviewed from literature, other internal factors may affect the performance of lecturers in HEI, such as motivation, job satisfaction, etc. It is therefore hoped that other researchers would study these aspects. Another limitation to consider was the generalizability of the sample. Although lecturers in these 10 HE institutions can share most characteristics with one another, they probably still differ from other institutions. Therefore, future research can collect more samples from other institutions to enhance the generalizability of the research.

Managerial Implications

According to research findings, we have identified the factors that affect the performance of lecturers: high income, good policies, favorable working environment, good infrastructure and not too heavy workload. Therefore, it is suggested that HE institutions should address these factors in order to get best performance from the teachers.

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

HE institutions should build a competitive salary system, depending on the type of institutions, whether private or state universities to determine the appropriate level of income. The nature and complexity of the job must be considered when determining how revenue is distributed. Additionally, HE institutions must create transparent, standard, and fair compensation structures for lecturers in similar working situations. In addition, HE institutions need to make the staff performance assessment and evaluation fair and correct, using the following tools and data sources: classroom observation; objective setting and individual interviews; teacher self-appraisal; teacher's portfolio; teacher testing; student evaluation. By performance evaluation, HE institutions can provide meaningful job performance feedback, so employees will recognize work achievements and strengths. Thus, the institutions can spot employee potential that has to be increased, developed, and supported. This can be a way to either motivate the employee to keep up the good job or to alter in areas where performance isn't up to par. Besides, HE institutions should provide enticing policies for career advancement and training, and pay more attention to their training programs. Furthermore, universities and academies should emphasize developing research skills, create uniform guidelines for how scientific researchers at all levels must present their research initiatives. Along with improving research paper quality, report writing that strictly adheres to the discursive genre structure of scientific writings in line with international standards also boosts publication competencies. As a result, HE institutions can strengthen their position and academic reputation both domestically and internationally. Besides, research collaboration with international scholars has a remarkable impact on the quantity and caliber of publications produced. Research cooperation and training can help lecturers get more knowledge of research methodology, thus improve their research skills.

In order to encourage employees to invest more talent in their organization, HE institutions should provide them with an ideal working environment that includes the necessary infrastructure and computer technology. In the context of blended learning, computer technology plays a very important role in any HE institution to achieve its goals. All strategies for increasing employee output are excellent, but they are meaningless without enhanced computer technology and equipment, as well as the resources that are needed.

Last but not least, HE institutions should foster a positive work environment. Unfortunately, a lot of institutions nowadays still maintain a rigid, impersonal atmosphere that comes with high formality. As a result, the structure should be decentralized with participative decision-making and upward communication flows. This will instill a sense of security in the workers in a workplace where management are constantly there to help when needed. Additionally, if lecturers have close, helpful, and cordial relationships with their leaders and colleagues at work, they will feel more faith in management and HE institutions, which will help them perform better.

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

Funding

This research did not receive any external funding.

Human Participants

The author confirms that research involving human participants, or personal data complies with all legal and ethical requirements and other applicable guidelines.

Originality Note

The author confirms that the manuscript is her original work, and if others' works are used, they are properly cited/quoted.

References

Alammary, A., Sheard, J., & Carbone, A. (2014). Blended learning in higher education: Three different design approaches. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *30*(4), 440-454. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.693

Aldraiweesh, A., & Alturki, U. (2023). Exploring factors influencing the acceptance of e-learning and students' cooperation skills in higher education. *Sustainability*, *15*(12), 9363. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15129363

Arifani, A. Z. T., & Susanti, A. Y. (2020). Literature review factors affecting employee performance: competence, compensation and leadership. *Dinasti International Journal of Economics, Finance & Accounting*, *1*(3), 538-549. https://doi.org/10.38035/dijefa.v1i3.491

Arinanye, R. T. (2015). *Organizational factors affecting employee performance at The College of Computing and Information Sciences (Cocis), Makerere University, Kampala-Uganda* [Unpublished master's dissertation]. Kampala: Uganda Technology and Management University.

Ata, R. (2016). An exploration of higher education teaching in second life in the context of blended learning. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, *15*(3), 9-26. http://www.tojet.net/articles/v15i3/1532.pdf

Auliana, S., Supriyanto, A. S., & Harini, S. (2021). Understanding teacher performance through leadership role, work environment, and work motivation. *Manageria: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, *6*(2), 155-168. https://doi.org/10.14421/manageria.2021.62-10

Çetin, E. (2021). Digital storytelling in teacher education and its effect on the digital literacy of pre-service teachers. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 39*, 100760. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100760

Chai, J. (2022). Study on the impact of teacher salary incentives on teachers' performance in higher education. *Frontiers in Humanities and Social Sciences*, *2*(5), 111-116. https://doi.org/10.54691/fhss.v2i5.717

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

Danielson, C. (2008). *The Handbook for Enhancing Professional Practice: Using the Framework for Teaching in Your School*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Dubey, P.; Pradhan, R. L.; Sahu, K. K. (2023). Underlying factors of student engagement to e-learning. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, *16*(1), 17-36. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-09-2022-0058

Fabriz, S., Hansen, M., Heckmann, C., Mordel, J., Mendzheritskaya, J., Stehle, S., Schulze-Vorberg, L., Ulrich, I., & Horz, H. (2021). How a professional development programme for university teachers impacts their teaching-related self-efficacy, self-concept, and subjective knowledge. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *40*(4), 738-752. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1787957

Gewasari, M. (2016). The effect of teacher competence, principal pedagogical leadership, school spiritual organizational culture, job satisfaction of teacher development, achievement motivation toward teacher performance of public senior high school in Deli Serdang District. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *21*(10), 29-38. https://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol.%2021%20Issue10/Version-11/E2110112938.pdf

Hasan, M. N. (2017). Influence of work motivation, leadership and organizational culture principal of the teacher performance in vocational school (SMK) Muhammadiyah, Rembang City, Central Java Province, Indonesia. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 9(2), 36-44. https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/EJBM/article/view/34905

Hasbay, D., & Altındag, E. (2018). Factors that affect the performance of teachers working in secondary level education. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, *22*(1), 1-19.

Hervie, D. M., & Winful, E. C. (2018). Enhancing teachers' performance through training and development in Ghana education service (A case study of Ebenezer senior high school). *Journal of Human Resource Management, 6*(1), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.jhrm.20180601.11

Huang, R., & Zhou, Y. (2012). Designing blended learning focused on knowledge category and learning activities: Case studies from Beijing Normal University. In C. J. Bonk, & C. R. Graham (Eds.), *The Handbook of Blended Learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs* (pp. 296-310). Wiley.

Jumani, N. B., Malik, S., & Akram, H. (2018). Challenges and successes of blended learning in directorate of distance education, IIIUI. *Pakistan Journal of Distance and Online Learning*, *4*(2), 143-156. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1267032.pdf

Kagema, J., & Irungu, C. (2018). An analysis of teacher performance appraisals and their influence on teacher performance in secondary schools in Kenya. *International Journal of Education*, *11*(1), 93-98. http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/ije.v11i1.11148

Kanya, N., Fathoni, A. B., & Ramdani, Z. (2021). Factors affecting teacher performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *10*(4), 1462-1468. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21693

Khan, S. H., Azhar, Z., Parveen, S., Naeem, F., & Sohail, M. M. (2012). Exploring the impact of infrastructure, pay incentives, and workplace environment on employees' performance (A case study of Sargodha University). *Asian Journal of Empirical Research*, *2*(4), 118-140. https://archive.aessweb.com/index.php/5004/article/view/2821

Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (1992). *Corporate Culture and Performance*. The Free Press.

Kowal, J., & Hassel, E. A. (2010). Measuring teacher and leader performance: Cross-sector lessons for excellent evaluations. Public Impact. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED539983.pdf

Lutfah, A., Hariyati, N., & Handayaningrum, W. (2019). Improved teacher performance through work culture and environment. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Studies*, *1*(8), 859-863. https://doi.org/10.29103/ijevs.v1i8.2240

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

Maryodona, M., Triwidayatsih, T., & Eddy, S. (2022). The effects of principal's leadership and infrastructure on teacher's performance. *Journal of Social Work and Science Education*, *3*(3), 247-257. https://doi.org/10.52690/jswse.v3i3.324

Mastrokoukou, S., Kaliris, A., Donche, V., Chauliac, M., Karagiannopoulou, E., Christodoulides, P., & Longobardi, C. (2022). Rediscovering teaching in university: A scoping review of teacher effectiveness in higher education. *Frontiers in Education, 7*: 861458. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.861458

Milanowski, A. (2011). Strategic measures of teacher performance. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *92*(7), 19-25. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171109200705

Molefe, G. N. (2010). Performance measurement dimensions for lecturers at selected universities: An international perspective. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, *8*(1), a243. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v8i1.243

Mulyana, Y., Chaeroni, N., Erlangga, H., Solahudin, M., Nurjaya, Sunarsi, D., Anggraeni, N., Jamalus, Masriah, I., Yuangga, K. D., & Purwanto, A. (2021). The influence of motivation, ability, organizational culture, work environment on teachers' performance. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT)*, *12*(7), 99-108. https://turcomat.org/index.php/turkbilmat/article/view/2549

Muslih, M., & Damanik, F. A. (2022). Effect of work environment and workload on employee performance. *International Journal of Economics, Social Science, Entrepreneurship and Technology (IJESET)*, *1*(1), 23-35. https://journal.sinergicendikia.com/index.php/ijeset/article/view/24

Naseem, I., Sikander, A., Hameed, N., & Khan, R. (2012). Factors affecting employees' performance: evidence from Pakistan. *Science Series Data Report, 4*(6), 141-174. https://ssrn.com/abstract=2152328

Ng, D. T. K.; Leung, J. K. L.; Su, J.; Ng, R. C. W.; Chu, S. K. W. (2023). Teachers' AI digital competencies and twenty-first century skills in the post-pandemic world. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *71*(1), 137-161. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-023-10203-6

Obineli, A. S. (2013). Teachers' perception of the factors affecting job satisfaction in Ekwusigo Local Government of Anambra State, Nigeria. *African Research Review*, *7*(4), 225-237. https://doi.org/10.4314/afrrev.v7i4.13

Orji, F. N. (2021). The influence of organizational incentives on teacher's academic performance in university secondary school students in Rivers State. *BW Academic Journal*, *2021*(2021), 60-67. https://www.bwjournal.org/index.php/bsjournal/article/view/34

Osifila, G. I., & Abimbola, A. T. (2020). Workload and lecturers' job satisfaction in Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, *14*(3), 416-423. https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v14i3.16140

Parveen, S., Sohail, M. M., Naeem, F., Azhar, Z., & Khan, S. H. (2012). Impact of office facilities and workplace milieu on employees' performance: A case study of Sargodha University. *Asian Journal of Empirical Research*. *2*(4), 96-117. https://archive.aessweb.com/index.php/5004/article/view/2814

Prifti, R. (2022). Self–efficacy and student satisfaction in the context of blended learning courses. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning, 37*(2), 111-125. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680513.2020.1755642

Rahardjo, S. (2014). The effect of competence, leadership and work environment towards motivation and its impact on the performance of teacher of elementary school in Surakarta city, Central Java, Indonesia. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, *3*(6), 59-74. https://garph.co.uk/Ijarmss/June2014/7.Pdf

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

Rasheed, M. I., Aslam, H. D., & Sarwar, S. (2010). Motivational issues for teachers in higher education: A critical case of IUB. *Journal of Management Research*, *2*(2), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.5296/JMR.V2I2.349

Rasheed, M. I., Humayon, A. A., Awan, U., & Ahmed, A. U. D. (2016). Factors affecting teachers' motivation: An HRM challenge for public sector higher educational institutions of Pakistan (HEIs). *International Journal of Educational Management*, *30*(1), 101-114. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-04-2014-0057

Sawchuk, S. (2015, September 03). Teacher evaluation: An issue overview. *Education Week*. https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/teacher-evaluation-an-issue-overview/2015/09

Selpiyani, L., Lian, B., & Putra, A. Y. (2021). The effect of workplace discipline and working conditions on teacher performance at MTS Negeri 2 OKU Timur. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Education Universitas PGRI Palembang (INCoEPP 2021)*, 1281-1285. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210716.255

Setyaningsih, S., & Sukono, S. (2022). Analysis of factors affecting lecturer performance at a university during the COVID-19 pandemic using logistic regression and genetic algorithms. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, *17*(2), 542-561. https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v17i2.6694

Silva, S.; Fernandes, J.; Peres, P.; Lima, V.; & Silva, C. (2022). Teachers' perceptions of remote learning during the pandemic: A case study. *Education Sciences, 12*(10), 698. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12100698

Sirait, D., Suriansyah, Ngadimun, Suhaimi. (2021). The influence of principal transformational leadership, work culture and work environment on teacher performance in state senior high schools throughout Banjarbaru city. *Journal of Advances in Education and Philosophy 5*(12), 391-400. https://saudijournals.com/media/articles/JAEP_512_391-400.pdf

Sogoni, E. C. (2017). *Influence of work environment on teacher performance in public secondary schools: a case study of Bungoma South Sub County, Kenya* [Master's dissertation, University of Nairobi]. http://hdl.handle.net/11295/101908

Ujir, H., Salleh, S. F., Marzuki, A. S. W., Hashim, H. F., Alias, A. A. (2020). Teaching workload in 21st century higher education learning setting. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *9*(1), 221-227. http://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i1.20419

Dr. Nguyen Thi Thuy Hanh is the main lecturer at English Faculty, Thuongmai University (formerly known as Vietnam University of Commerce), Vietnam. Her main role is teaching Business English. She got her PhD degree in Linguistics. Besides, she also got an MA in Business Administration. Her research interests include teaching methods, English language and business administration.

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-09-11]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.4.4.32]

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) which allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format for non-commercial purposes only, and only so long as attribution is given to the creator.